

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,073	12/28/2001	Tetsuya Nagano	NGB-12833	2231
40854 7	590 07/07/2004		EXAMINER	
RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP			LONEY, DONALD J	
4080 ERIE ST WILLOUGHB	кеет Ү, ОН 44094-7836		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	,		1772	

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/034,073	NAGANO ET AL.	
Auvisory Aution	Examiner	Art Unit	•
	Donald Loney	1772	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPRING FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPRING FROM Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in	ıed
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
 a)	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the lan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe late on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension e fee. The appropriate extension fee the final Office action; or (2) as set for	fee under orth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note			
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifyin	g the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	l be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendi	ment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NOT place	the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	oroved or b)☐ disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:		Jame of the	
	,	Donald Loney Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1772	

Application No.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The broadest reasonable interpretation of the structure of the claims has been shown in the prior art. The applicant argues that the references only show figures that are schematic in nature and can not be taken literally, however, these figures alone read upon the structure of the instant claims. The applicant also argues that a square wave or trapezoidal wave would not be considered a half saw tooth, however, given its broadest interpretation any truncated or half cut off square, trapezoid, rectangle (positioned vertically and half cut off as shown by the square wave) or triangle can be considered half saw tooth. The instant claims fail to structurally define over the prior art. Saw teeth can come in a variety of different shapes of which the applicant has not distinquished over the prior art with the limitation half-saw tooth.